REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14-19, 22-23, and 27-33 are pending. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. No claims have been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14-19, 22, 23 and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,414,644 of Tayler ("Tayler"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 sets forth a cache to store **disposable information** that may be overwritten without ever having delivered the disposable information to a system memory if the disposable information has been read at least once. In contrast, Tayler fails to disclose a cache to store such disposable information. The Examiner analogized the modified read data in Tayler to the disposable information set forth in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the analogy. According to Tayler, if the data in the cache is modified, i.e., different than the data in the backing store, then the modified data is destaged to the backing store and then effectively erased from the cache. Otherwise, if the data in the cache is not modified, the data is erased once the data has been read by a host or other components in the system. (Tayler, col. 2, lines 6-17). The determining factor on whether to destage the data from the cache to the backing store is *whether the data has been modified.* However, the disposable information in claim 1 is information that may be overwritten without ever having delivered the disposable information to a system memory if the disposable information has been read at least once. In other words, the disposable information in claim 1 is information that is meant to be read by a system component only once. It is respectfully submitted that whether the information has been

modified is irrelevant to whether the information is meant to be read by a system component only once. Therefore, Tayler fails to disclose a cache to store disposable information as claimed in claim 1. For at least this reason, Tayler fails to anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Tayler fails to anticipate claims 11, 23, 27, and 33. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12, 14-19, 22, and 28-32 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, 23, and 27. Therefore, Tayler fails to anticipate claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12, 14-19, 22, and 28-32 for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 9, 2004

Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300